

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed June 30, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed November 7, 2005 have been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claims 1-10 and 12-26 were pending in the application. Claims 13-25 have been withdrawn. By this paper, claim 1 has been amended and claim 12 has been canceled. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 13-26 are now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is requested for at least the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 196 00 348 ("Lewecke") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,922 ("Lisec"). Claim 1 has been amended. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn because the references, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claim. For example, Lewecke and Lisec do not teach or suggest that

at least one glass plate, from which a loading portion is separated, is provided with at least two different scribing lines before performing step b, said loading portion being completely scribed before performing step b, such that the loading portion, after severing and delivering to the glass processing installation, is adapted to be divided in the desired portions without another scribing operation,

as recited in claim 1. As the Advisory Action correctly points out, Lewecke does not disclose "the glass plate sheet being scribed before dividing the sheet." Advisory Action at p. 2. Lewecke merely discloses cutting a sheet to size at the workstation, preferably with a saw, according to a cutting plan, such that the sheet is completely divided at the workstation and the remaining sheet is stored for later use. *See* English translation of Lewecke at p. 7, lines 16-18. Thus, Lewecke completely divides the sheet at a workstation and then stores the remaining sheet for further use. To the contrary, the claimed invention requires that the "completely scribed" loading portion be divided only after being delivered to the "glass processing installation."

Lisec does not perform a dividing operation “after severing and delivering to the glass processing installation.” Lisec discloses notching a glass panel (1) with three X-cuts (a left X-cut, a middle X-cut and a right X-cut), conveying the glass panel through three or four breaking stations (3, 4, 8, and 10), and then sending the sections of the glass panel into a storing device (12) or double-glazing line. Like Lewecke, however, Lisec performs the breaking or dividing prior to the sections of the glass panel being delivered to the storage device. *See* Lisec at Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 50-63.

Further, Lewecke and Lisec do not teach or suggest “wherein steps a and b are repeated such that glass plates are extracted from the storage unit and loading portions are delivered to the glass processing installation in a *predetermined sequence*,” as required by claim 1. In particular, the references do not provide loading portions with scribing lines and store the remainders of the glass plates in a storage unit, which allows the glass processing installation to be fed with a *predetermined sequence* of scribed loading portions so that a subsequent positioning for a scribing operation is no longer needed. Lewecke merely discloses that the placing into and out of storage is computer controlled. *See* Lewecke at p. 2, lines 34-36. Lewecke does not deliver a predetermined sequence of glass plates from the storage unit to the glass processing installation. Furthermore, Lisec does not teach or suggest a loading portion that is sent to the installation and a remainder portion that is stored. All parts are stored. *See* Lisec at Fig. 2; and col. 2, line 64 to col. 3, line 20. Therefore, there is *no predetermined sequence* in loading the installation. Accordingly, for all of these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Lewecke and Lisec.

Claims 2-10 and 26 depend from claim 1 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

### Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 30, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Jessica M. Palmer Reg. 56,986 for  
JESSICA M. PALMER  
George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072